**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**
**CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**
**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1568 OF 2005**
**ALONGWITH**
**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1569 OF 2005**
**ALONGWITH**
**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1570 OF 2005**
**ALONGWITH**
**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1574 OF 2005**
**ALONGWITH**
**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1577 OF 2005**
**ALONGWITH**
**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1580 OF 2005**
**ALONGWITH**
**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1581 OF 2005**
**ALONGWITH**
**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.1582 OF 2005**

Mr.Rohit Mehta ...Petitioner

Versus

M/s. Jaybharat Credit Ltd.
and Anr. ...Respondents

.....

Mr. Niranjan Mundargi i/b M/s. Arpan Rajput & Co. Advocate for Petitioner
Mr. S.R. Shinde APP in WP Nos. 1568/05
Mr. B.H. Mehta, APP in WP Nos.1569 & 1580/05
Mr.V.B. Konde Deshmukh, APP in WP Nos 1570 & 1581/05
Mr. Y.S. Shinde, APP in WP Nos.1574 & 1582/05
Mr. R.S. Khadapkar, APP in WP No. 1577/05.

.....

**CORAM: SMT. V.K. TAHILRAMANI, J.**
**DATED: 27TH SEPTEMBER, 2005**

**P. C.:-**

1. Heard the learned advocate for the petitioner and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for quashing of process issued against him in Criminal Case Nos.1654/S/2003, 1616/S/2003, 169/S/2003, 1834/S/2003 446/S/2003, 445/S/2003, 444/S/2003 and 1476/S/2003 which are

pending in the Court of learned Additional/Chief M. M. 33rd Court, at Ballard Pier, Mumbai. In the said cases, process has been issued against the petitioner under Section 138 r.w. 141 of N. I. Act.

3. For the reasons recorded in the decision of this Court in the case of **V.K. Jain & Ors. Vs. Pratap V. Padode and Anr, reported in 2005(3) Mh.L.J. 778,** in my opinion, the petitioner has an efficacious remedy of preferring revision against the order of Magistrate issuing process. Hence, in my view, it would be appropriate that the petitioner prefers revision before the concerned Sessions Court against the order of the Magistrate issuing process.

4. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to prefer revision before the concerned Sessions Court. The learned advocate for the petitioner states that the necessary revision would be preferred within a period of four weeks from today. In view of this statement, the trial Court shall not proceed with the trial for a period of four weeks from today.

5. On the necessary revision being preferred by the petitioner before the concerned Sessions Court, the concerned Sessions Court shall dispose of the same on merits after hearing necessary parties.

6. Writ Petitions are disposed of.

*****